DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 344 HE 014 811

AUTHOR Craig, Bruce M.
TITLE An Analysis of Characteristics of Education Institutions Supported by AoA for Planning and Development of Instructional Programs in Aging.
PUB DATE 9 Nov 81
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Joint Annual Meeting of the Canadian Association of Gerontology and the Gerontological Society of America (Toronto, Ontario, Canada, November 9, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Aging (Individuals); *College Programs; Federal Aid; *Gerontology; Government School Relationship; *Grants; *Health Personnel; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; Older Adults; Professional Associations; Professional Education; *Public Policy; Training
IDENTIFIERS *Administration on Aging

ABSTRACT

The institutional characteristics of postsecondary colleges and universities that were successful in all Administration on Aging (AoA) grant program competitions for career training or personnel in aging through the 1980-81 academic year are analyzed. The sustaining ability of first-time grantees in new AoA program competitions are compared to see if the advantage of prior funding varies by institutional categories. Additionally, the possible relationship between sustaining membership in the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education is examined as an indicator of institutional commitment to instructional programs in gerontology by comparing institutional and funding support characteristics of members and nonmembers among AoA grantees. It is suggested that some of the proposals advanced in recent years as alternatives to AoA's support of long-term training activity can be questioned, given the Reagan Administration's intent to reduce the size and status of the Department of Education and to reduce funding support for health professions training and general student financial assistance. Attention is directed to program transitions and funding history, the 1979 gerontology career preparation program competition, displacement impact of the new multidisciplinary centers program, merging the old multidisciplinary center and career training program, and classifications of institutions that AoA is currently supporting. It is concluded that the ability of institutions to successfully compete in an open competition is linked to the size and duration of initial support by AoA as well as the size of student enrollment, auspices, and level of instruction offered. (Author/SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED213344

AN ANALYSIS OF CHARACTERISTICS OF EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS SUPPORTED BY AoA FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS IN AGING

Bruce M. Craig

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bruce M. Craig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

[X] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Prepared for the 1981 Joint Annual Meeting of the Canadian Association of Gerontology and the Gerontological Society of America, November 9, 1981, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

* Opinions expressed in this paper are solely those of the author.

HE 014 811

ABSTRACT

The Administration on Aging (AoA) has funded instructional programs in gerontology since 1966. The philosophy of the new Administration with respect to Federal support for higher education and training and concomitant budget reductions in social services now raise the issue of continuing support for this purpose.

This paper analyzes the institutional characteristics of postsecondary colleges and universities which were successful in all AoA grant program competitions for career training of personnel in aging through the current year. It also compares the sustaining ability of first time grantees in new AoA program competitions to see if the advantage of prior funding varies by institutional categories. Finally, it examines the possible relationship between sustaining membership in the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education (AGHE) as an indicator of institutional commitment to instructional programs in gerontology by comparing institutional and funding support characteristics of members and nonmembers among AoA grantees.

The analysis concludes that the ability of institutions to successfully compete in an open competition is linked to the size and duration of initial support by AoA as well as the size of student enrollment, auspices and level of instruction offered. Concern is expressed about selected classifications of institutions which AoA is currently supporting through the 1980-81 academic year on their ability to sustain activities if AoA funding is reduced or eliminated.

Introduction

Over the past 15 years, the Administration on Aging has awarded over $69 million in discretionary grants to plan and implement instructional programs in aging in 208 postsecondary education institutions. It is estimated that as many as 12,000 students have pursued career interests in aging through enrollment in these projects, about 5,000 of whom have received some form of student financial assistance. Many times this number have participated by attending courses, seminars, and workshops, including a large number of part-time, weekend, and night students who already work in aging related jobs.

Federal interest in supporting postsecondary institutions to develop gerontology programs, recruit faculty, and train students derives from its interest in improving the quality and availability of services and programs for the elderly and its perception that shortages exist in the numbers of trained personnel who plan, administer, or provide such services.

For most of the 15 years that AoA has supported instructional development and improvement, the primary goal was to intitiate interest and stimulate activity in disciplines and professions traditionally associated with research, training, and practice of public and social service-oriented programs. Early emphasis was on development of a leadership cadre that, while enrolled in and completing a traditional curriculum leading to award of a graduate degree, would share and experience a common core of knowledge about the normal biological processes of aging and the psychological, economic and social problems frequently encountered by older adults. As funding increased for governmental programs for older adults, especially programs which provided direct and indirect services, the need for planners, administrators and managers within public agencies surpassed the need for teachers, researchers, and policy analysts. For a time the resources of the program matched the expansion of interests and the perceptions of need. Among the more recent program directions were priorities for different categories of service professionals and training for occupations requiring less than a graduate degree.

In recent years Congress has expressed concern with AoA's continued strategy for provision of seed money without corresponding assessment of the need for categories of personnel. This concern has been expressed in two ways. One, by increasing the specificity of priorities inserted in the language of periodic resuthorizations of the Older American Act, and two, by mandating that AoA, through the Commissioner on Aging, develop and implement a "national manpower policy for the field of aging." The goal of this policy is expressed in various ways, but its purpose is clearly to provide more focus and justification for continuing support to education and related organizations for training.

Recent Events and Activities

Questions about AoA's purpose and role in supporting gerontology programs in postsecondary education institutions were intensified after the arrival of the new Administration. Some of the proposals that were advanced in recent years as alternatives to AoA's support of long term training activity, such as transferral of this responsibility to the Department of Education, or restriction of eligibility to exclude medical schools and health institutions, can be called into question given the new Administration's intent to reduce the size and status of the Department of Education and to reduce funding support for health professions training and general student financial assistance.

Continuation of AoA Long Term Training Support

Support for continuation of AoA assistance to instructional programs in aging at postsecondary education institutions have been subject to increasing scrutiny in recent years. A Preliminary Report on the Development and Implementation of a Federal Manpower Policy for the Field of Aging (AoA,1980), submitted to Congress by AoA in the Fall of 1980, argues that aging is still an emerging field, requiring continued nurturing by the Federal government to gain maturity. It also argues that since much of the demand for personnel providing services to the elderly is traceable to Federal social programs, the Federal government has an obligation to see that the training and employment markets are stabilized.

Critics of Federal support for continuation of education and training in aging point out that if demand is tied closely to Federal support, the new Administration's budget reductions and shift in domestic priorities should have the impact of reducing demand for new personnel in aging organizations which in turn reduces the need for support of education institutions and students. Proponents argue that the Federal budget for the elderly has not declined significantly in comparison to earlier years, and that demand for services from both public and private sources will continue to rise given uncontestable demographic trends in the number and proportion of elderly citizens in the U.S. population.

Specific issues regarding the future of AoA support for long term train-in aging are tied to the notion of whether or not there is a self-sustaining institutional capacity to fulfill needs however they are determined. Both proponents and opponents of a future role for AoA in support of building or sustaining capacity cite findings from the recently completed Evaluation of the Title IV-A Career Training in Aging Program (KETRON,1981) to support their arguments. Proponents cite findings which indicate that, AoA with comparatively modest levels of funds, has generated considerable interest and activity in gerontology in post-secondary institutions and has produced a a high proportion of program graduates that find jobs in the aging field.

Opponents cite findings that indicate a significantly higher level of unemployment of graduates with degrees in gerontology contrasted with graduates who have a minor, or a certificate or only take courses in gerontology. In their view, these findings evidence a saturation in aging specific jobs which obviates further Federal responsibility for assuring that personnel shortages are met. Proponents, seeing the same evidence, acknowledge difficulties in the search for jobs by undergraduates with degrees, believe that much of the problem lies with regional placement of undergraduate programs, the overall quality of institutions that have these programs and the awareness of employers. Proponents that question the value of undergraduate degrees in aging disagree with those that believe a saturation point in employment has been reached, pointing out that the average unemployment rate of graduate

students with majors or concentrations in gerontology is significantly less in graduate level programs and quite comparable with rates found for majors of new degree holders in other fields.

Which side has the better argument in the current debate for continuation of AoA support for postsecondary aging education programs is difficult to determine given the inadequacy of information on its need and benefits. To build a strong case, proponents need to demonstrate that the a link between education and service programs exists; that certain types of instructional programs and aging content are more beneficial than others; that existing capacity is insufficent for supplying the number of desired graduates required; that only the Federal government has the resources to build needed capacity; and that over time, Federal support need only be temporary.

Questions related to the quantity and quality of personnel needed are not new to aging. On previous occasions when AoA long term training programs have been threatened by budget cuts, a sympathetic Congress restored funding on the basis that gerontology was a new field requiring Federal support. That argument is again offered in defense of continuing support. Congress, however, no longer receives this plea with the same degree of sympathy as it has in the past. Considering the current fiscally conservative philosophy of both the Administration and Congress, it is difficult to restore funding to its previous levels. The woeful state of information on supply and demand for aging personnel, previously mentioned, excarbates any defense that is based on the effectiveness of previous funding priorities. Given these conditions, future Federal funding support for education institutions to plan, develop, and support instructional programs of gerontology may continue to decline. With fears for the careers and programs they have developed in partnership with AoA, most gerontological educators find this prospect discoraging.

Predicting the Impact of Federal Training Support

The probablity of a specific gerontology instructional program failing

due to the loss of Federal funding is difficult to predict without consideration of circumstances unique to that program's initiation and development. Nevertheless, it may be reasoned that an estimate of the total number of instructional programs that are vulnerable to Federal funding loss may be derived by extrapolating from the experience of past program competitions that included a cutback in funding and the subsequent experiences of unfunded programs.

The survival of strong programs without AoA funding can presumably be linked either to replacement of AoA support with other outside support, or greater reliance on the resource capabilities of its host academic institution. There is much evidence in the statistics kept by the National Science Foundation that institutions that have resources of their own are also the most successful in competing for Federal support in social science research, development and other activities. Institutions which are at the margin of Federal support are therefore presumably less likely to find replacement support if they lose funding in an program area which they have previously been successful.

Looking at the resource characteristics and post-funding experiences of institutions which were affected by past reductions in AoA funding for new grant training competitions may provide indications of the severity of the impact of future funding reductions for gerontology. The first step in performing such an analysis is see if in the history of AoA support there have been events and sets of circumstances in which to base predictions of future funding reductions.

Program Transitions and Funding History

The history of AoA's support for instructional programs in aging, as recently reported in A Preliminary Report on the Development and Implementation of a Federal Manpower Policy for the Field of Aging (AoA, 1980), indicates that program policy changes occurred most frequently during periods of episodic growth in the AoA budget for discretionary activities. Budget increases and growth of interest in gerontology had a positive impact on the number of proposals re-

ceived by AoA for new competitions. This measure of demand was unaffected by changes in program announcements and guidelines that announced new funding priorities.

Major program changes and funding levels are indicated in Table 1. The table does not indicate the total number of new award competitions held within each major program period. The best sources of information on the Title V Traineeships in Aging Program are Ketron (1972) and Tibbetts (1973). Selected policy changes that occurred in the Title IV-A Career Training in Aging Program are described in the issue paper prepared by Craig and Greenberg (1981). A comprehensive description of this program is in Ketron (1981). The current Title IV-A Gertontology Career Preparation Program is described in the Craig and Greenberg issue paper and the 1979 AoA Education and Training Guidelines (1979).

A major feature of all program announcements and competitions from 1966 through 1978 in which new priorities and objectives were announced was that they most often occurred in conjunction with an increase in the program budget. Guidelines were also permissive during this period, allowing AoA to fund programs at institutions previously supported under other guidelines while funding new priorities. The most astute institutions, according to Ketron (1981), were able to recast old programs in new priorities without great discomfort.

Had all changes in AoA budgets and program guidelines remained incremental it would not be possible to find information of the kind required to indicate the potential impact of funding loss. Despite all appearances indicated by the data in Table 1, the transition between the Title IV-A Career Training in Aging and Gerontology Career Preparation Programs which occurred between 1978 and 1979 did not result in an incremental increase in program resources. As will be shown, AoA funding for training programs at this time not only decreased significantly in the aggregate, but also , due to changes in program priorities, greatly impacted the categories of institutionally based instructional programs.

The FY1979 Gerontology Career Preparation Program Competition

In order to understand the strengths and limitations of projecting data from the 1979 Gerontology Career Preparation Program competition, it is necessary to describe some of the circumstances of that period, beginning in 1978, with the almost simultaneous appointment of a new Commissioner on Aging and Congressional reauthorization of the Older Americans Act.

The new Commissioner's agenda and preliminary versions of the reauthorization legislation established new directions for all discretionary programs, but had special impact on programs that involved training and education. Under reorganization in 1978, a new Office on Education and Training was established to bring together all training programs under Title IV-A and the Multidisciplinary Centers of Aging Program under Titte IV-C (changed to Title IV-E with reauthorization). The first major product of this unit was development of a program plan and separate program guidelines (AoA, 1979) for nearly a dozen new activities under these two Older Americans Act sub-titles. As will be shown, one impact of this new planning strategy was to actually reduce the level of funding AoA had been providing for programmatic long term training.

Displacement Impact of the new Multidisciplinary Centers Program

One of the Commissioner's primary targets for change was the Mulitidisciplinary Gerontology Centers Program, reauthorized by the 1978 Amendments under Title IV-E, but previously identified with Title IV-C. In its reauthorization Congress had inserted as a new clause in an existing provision that the program should fund centers of "special emphasis" as well as the more generalized centers previously supported. The new Commissioner made a decision to only fund centers of "special emphasis" of two kinds: 1) long-term care centers that would bring together medical schools and social service institutions; and 2) subject-focused policy centers that would encompass many other major policy area priorities expressed in the Older Americans Act.

The creation of special purpose centers occurred at the expense of the 43 existing centers in several ways. Funding for the program remained at the same level as in previous years, but fewer awards were made to create larger centers. Furthermore, perponderance of funding was allocated to the long-term care centers initiative, where every application was required to include arrangements between social service organizations, gerontology programs and a medical school. The later requirement was, in part, a special effort intended to entice medical schools into partnership with AoA.

The end result was that while a select few old multidisciplinary centers were successrul in the new long term care center competition, most were not, and those that were shared their good fortune with other organizations. Moreover, the emphasis on training held by many of the old multidisciplinary centers was now shared with research and other functional activities.

The same impact on a smaller scale occurred with respect to the new National Aging Policy Study Centers. Only six policy study centers were funded at levels no greater than the average annual award held by the old centers. While most of these new centers were at institutions that held awards under the old program, as in the case of the long term care centers, training was no longer the pre-eminent function to be supported.

Merging the Old Multidisciplinary Center and Career Training Program

Recognizing the probable reluctance of some institutions and the inability of others, to compete under the new Multidisiciplinary Centers priorities, coupled with the inevitablity of funding loss that would occur by making fewer awards, AoA sought to cushion the impact of its decisions by creating a new multidisciplinary project category in the new Title IV-A Gerontology Career Training Program.

Redirection of the Multidisciplinary Center Program and establishment of a separate category of "university-wide multidisciplinary projects" ap-

peared to resolve a persistent problem of overlap between the old Center and the career training programs. Two-thirds of the 43 multidisciplinary center grantees in 1978 also received Career Training funds, and almost all of the remaining one-third had received Career Training grants in previous years. To achieve clear delineation between the Title IV-A and Title IV-C and E programs, the FY1979 guidelines made their purposes and priorities distinctively different. If the 43 existing centers wished to continue a program emphasis on instructional programs, then they would have to compete only for Title IV-A funding.

AoA recognized that support for instructional training programs developed under the old Career Training and Mulitidisiciplinary Center Programs would be impacted by the guideline decisions, even though overall funding for Title IV-A training would be increased in the budget. To partially counteract the effect of merger, a special category was established for the FY1979 new project competition for the Title IV-A Gerontology Career Preparation Program university programs with multidisiciplinary participation. The tentative funding reservation for this category nearly equaled the total budget for the old Title IV-E program, but was considerably less than the funding awarded for institutions participating in both the Title IV-E and Title IV-A programs in FY1978.

Institutional Categories Within Career Training

The reservation of funds for universities with multidisiciplinary training programs could not be increased and still accomplish the new directions sought for the Title IV-A Gerontology Career Preparation Program. Other Title IV-A training funds were to be used to support the development of an in-service and continuing education infrastructure using regional AoA offices as coordination points, to maintain the state education and training program, to develop trainer materials, and to support three fellowship programs. Furthermore, AoA had interest in continuing, if not expanding, its support for instructional programs to other institutional classifications. The establishment of three additional categories for the career program not only gave notification of AoA's interest, but served to protect them from the better grantsmanship skills of the

university programs. These categories were: 1) two and four year colleges, 2) graduate and professional schools, and 3) consortia arrangements involving institutions from any category.

Undergraduate institutions, including historically Black colleges, were the principal beneficiaries of the change in program policy and were now protected by a separate category for review of applications and consideration for award. Consortia arrangements were supported with some frequency in prior years, but not at the level established nor the number indicated in the new program guidelines. Graduate and professional schools were supported with some frequency since 1975. The establishment of a separate category for these institutions only made this priority clearer, and for the first time expressly invited applications from health professions that represented inter-disiclipinary approaches to gerontology. The net impact of the establishment of separate competition categories was to encourage more applications from institutions not previously supported.

The creation of separate categories for competition was the major, but not the only, difference between the old and new career preparation programs. New career priorities encouraged health and mental health schools and colleges to compete for the first time in an AoA competition. The heavy emphasis on job training and placement most likely forced some institutions to choose between continuing their present programs or ajusting them in line with the new AoA priorities. The increased institutional pressures for finding sources of financial support for their programs no doubt encouraged some institutions to submit an application, even if there was no real interest in the AoA priorities. Some institutions that had programs previously funded probably felt with some confidence that the changes required for application and award were largely cosmetic. These feelings were reported by directors of gerontology programs even before the 1979 guidelines in evaluation interviews (KETRON, 1981).

Impact of FY1979 Training Program Competition on Institutions

The impact of AoA program decisions governing the 1979 AoA long term training competition was, as described, considerably more complex than a simple reduction in funding. The displacement of university programs from the old Title IV-C Multidisciplinary Centers Program and the displacements resulting from the switch to competition within four institutional categories affected a large number of institutions which had received support in 1978 or earlier. Some of the institutions that previously received Title IV-C Multidiciplinary Center support chose not to compete under either the new IV-A guidelines or respond to the two new special emphasis Title IV-E center solicitations. A few submitted a proposal in one initiative area. Most, however, submitted proposals in at least one initiative or category of both programs.

Of those that elected to compete in the IV-A program, three-quarters were successful in receiving an award. A few successfully competed in the newly created category for consortia arrangements after recruiting other institutions to submit a joint application under their leadership. Despite considerable success in competition with institutions not previously supported by AoA, almost a dozen institutions that were funded under the Multidisciplinary Center Program in 1978 were not funded under either program in 1979.

Two years have passed since the FY1979 competition impacted the continuation of AoA support for instructional programs at individual institutions. As indicated, a number of institutions were not successful in renewing AoA support as a result of that competition, including an unknown number of programs of acceptable quality that fell just below the cut-off point for funding. Future funding cuts would have the likely impact of moving the funding line for qualified proposals even higher. What happended to the on-going instructional programs that

were not successful in winning AoA support in 1979? Have they abandoned their programs? Do they still have the same fidelity and magnitude of activity as when they were supported by AoA? Have they secured support from their institutions or have they been successful in obtaining other funds?

Answers to these questions may forecast the impact of what may occur when future program competitions are held for reduced levels of support. A study investigating these questions through telephone interviews with faculty members associated with formerly funded AoA projects is currently in process. The data collected and examined for this paper supports this investigation by analysis of institutional characteristics and intensity of previous AoA support thereby generating hypothoses on future impacts of funding withdrawals. The accuracy of these deductions will be compared with the collected interview data.

Characteristics of Institutions Supported by AoA for Career Training

Analysis of the FY1979 program competition is enlightened by contrast with characteristics of the institutions AoA has supported throughout its history. Table 1, previously referenced, breaks out the number and type of awards to institutions by the three major periods of programmatic change. The table is structured for the reader to see the overlap of institutions between program breaks, each of which was initiated by a new open project competition.

The figures include 40 of the 43 old Title IV-C Multidisiplinary Centers supported from 1975 to 1978, although only two-thirds of them overlapped with the Title IV-A Career Training in Aging Program in 1968. Among other peculiarities that are glossed over by this table arrangement are institutions which were discontinuously funded as a result of competions occurring during the three program periods shown.

The total of 208 institutions identified as the unduplicated number receiving AoA support includes planning grant competitions for 1976 and 1977. The few planning grants made earlier, not awarded on the basis of

TABLE 1

Postsecondary Education Institutions Receiving AoA Long Term Training Grants by Program Period and Type of Award, 1970-81

Program Title and Authority		AoA Funding ($ in millions)
Title V Traineeships in Aging (1966-1972)		$ 18.1
Individual Awards	32	
Consortia Participants	20	
Sub-total:	52	
Title IV-A Career Training in Aging (1973-1978)		$ 28.5
Individual Awards		
Title V	28	
Title IV-A	77	
Consortia Participants		
Title V	17	
Title IV-A	48	
Subtotal:	170	
Title IV-A Career Preparation Program (1979-1980)		$ 22.5
Individual Awards		
Title V	20	
Title IV-A (Pre-1979)	31	
Title IVA (1979-)	21	
Consortia Participants		
Title V	0	
Title IV-A (Pre-1979)	15	
Title IV-A (1979)	23	
Sub-Total:	110	
Unduplicated Count of Institutions (1966-1981)		$ 69.1
Individual Awards	117	
Individual Awards and Former Consortia Participants	13	
Consortia Participants and Former Individual Awards Last Supported in a Consortia	78	
Total:	208	

Source: Program Files, Division of Education and Career Preparation, Office of Education and Training, AoA.

a formal competition, are not included.

The total does not include any institutions that received support from the following AoA activities:

1) short term training (1975-79,
2) quality improvement award (1975-8),
3) dissertation research awards (1975-1981),
4) state contracts and grants to institutions using funds provided under the State Education and Training Program, (1974-81,), and
5) all of the special purpose training activities that were established by AoA under Title IV-A in 1979.

An estimated 100 additional postsecondary education institutions have directly or indirectly benefited from these other training activities.

The data displayed in Table 1 indicate only some of the differences in institutional funding that have occurred in the three programs. For the first 4 years of the Title V program, only 17 institutions were supported. The rest were first funded in 1970-71 when the budget was increased. Increases in the Title IV-A Career Training in Aging Program in 1974, 1976 and 1977 were also a result of an increased budget for discretionary activities. As a consequence, the differences in the number of institutions supported and the level of support for the program between the last year of the Career Training in Aging Program and the Gerontology Career Preparation Program were not as large as indicated by the table.

The unduplicated count of 208 institutions constitutes the baseline of data for all analyses conducted for this paper. For most purposes only individual awards are studied because of the difficulty in ascribing attributes to multi-institutional groups.

It is somewhat useful to note the apparent differences in turnover for the two classes of awards shown in Table 1 . For example, the data indicate that there was nearly a 50 percent turnover of institutions in the transition between the two IV-A programs, much higher than

during the transition from Title V to Title IV-A. This difference is believed to be, in part, accounted for by the fact that AoA did not routinely announce its competitions until 1975. The higher turnover rate, however, still supports the thesis that competition in 1979 was far greater than that in 1973 and the possiblity that programs of acceptable qualtiy were not funded in 1979.

The higher rate of turnover indicated for institutions supported through consortia suggests the difficulty in developing and sustaining viable instructional programs through such arrangements. Only a few consortia funded by AoA were formed prior to their interest in collaboration for the sake of a proposal to AoA, or at the time of application the consortia did not involve any other activity but aging. This suggests that most consorita were contrived as a temporary phenomena for the convenience of gaining outside support.

The 17 consortia that AoA has supported can be grouped into three size categories for analysis: 5 consortia had 2 members, 8 consortia had 3-5 members and 4 consorita had 7 or more members. Half of the 12 consoritia with more than 2 members were all small private baccalareate or public community colleges. Consortia consisting of 2 or 3 members were found to be of short duration and frequently included large doctoral universities and a member that previously received AoA support. Members of consortia fitting this description that later broke from the consortia often were successful in winning an individual award.

The superiority of resources possessed by larger institutions in a consortia are thought to account for much of the inverse relationship found between the number of institutions in a consortia and its continued support by AoA. Large institutions with superior resources have a lesser need than smaller institutions to form temporary arrangements to gain external support. The greater the number of institutions in a consortia, the fewer resources are available for distribution, thus decreasing the impact of those resources and increasing the likelihood of dissatisfaction among members for continuation.

Selected Institutional Characteristics of AoA Training Grantees

Characteristics of institutions supported through individual or consortia awards are compared in Table 2. For the purpose of this table, the 18 institutions receiving support both individually and as a member of a consortia have been assigned to the category of most recent AoA support.

TABLE 2

Characteristics of Postsecondary Education Institutions Receiving AoA Long Term Training Grants, 1975-1980

	Consortia	Individual	Total
Institutions	78	130	208
Public Support and Control	47 (61%)	89 (67%)	136 (65%)
Undergraduate Degree Highest	40 (51%)	29 (22%)	69 (33%)
Student Enrollment under 5,000	43 (55%)	42 (32%)	85 (41%)
Historically Black Institution	11 (14%)	20 (15%)	31 (15%)
Current AGHE Member	21 (27%)	87 (67%)	106 (51%)
AoA Support in 1973	22 (28%)	71 (55%)	93 (45%)
AoA Support in 1979	38 (49%)	72 (55%)	110 (53%)

Sources: See Appendix for explanation of characteristics and source of data.

A number of differences are indicated for consortia member institutions and individual awardee institutions. A higher proportion of consortia members represent private, undergraduate and low enrollment colleges. A lower proportion of these institutions currently hold membership in the Association for Gernontology in Higher Education. (AGHE). No difference is shown in the proportion of institutions which have a Black heritage. The differences in proportions supported by AoA in 1978 and 1979 reflect the encouragement for consortia given in the Career Preparation Program Guidelines and the protection provided by the establishment of a separate consortia category.

The values of several institutional characteristics shown in Table 2 were collapsed at their mid-point or other significant value. A closer examination of their discrete values provides some interest. The table shows most supported institutions offered at least one graduate degree. Nearly half (46%) of all institutions, including four-fifths (79%) of all institutions supported by an individual award, were found to offer a doctorate degree. Since no doctoral degrees are offered in aging, the implications of such findings are not to be related to the type of aging certification offered, rather as intended, as a measure of resource availability.

The percentage difference in average size of student enrollment shown in Table 2 between institutions supported individually and through consortia arrangements is even greater when only high enrollment institutions are compared. Nearly one-third (29%) of individual awardees have enrollment of more than 20,000 students, or nearly three times the proportion of high enrollment institutions represented in consortia (10%).

The inference of a relationship between high student enrollment and the offering of a doctorate degree and other characteristics of instructional programs supported by AoA should be made carefully. Most AoA supported programs at graduate-level universities offer degrees or certificates in aging at the master level whether or not they offer a doctoral degree in some other discipline or field. Furthermore, Some graduate programs with high enrollment have low enrollment of students in aging.

Nevertheless, the suggested link between institutional resources and continued survival in competition with other institutions, and a very tenuous link to program quality, find reinforcement in the some of the findings of the national evaluation of the Career Training in Aging Program (Ketron, 1981). The evaluation team repeatedly expresses its admiration of the level of effort triggered by AoA funds which they found to be realatively small compared to other Federal training programs.

The study also reported that recruitment of students for graduate programs frequently took place within the university. Thus institutions with large enrollments not only have the advantage of more students from which to select, but they also have greater awareness of individual strengths and weaknesses.

Impact of the 1979 Program Competition on Institutional Categories

The data displayed in the two previous tables established the universe and general characteristics of training institutions funded by AoA in the past 15 years. Table 3 indicates the impact of the progran new grant competition which took place in 1979, marking a transition between the two Title IV-A programs. The population used in this table includes 102 institutions that received at least one year of AoA support in the three years preceding the 1979 competition. The coincidental exact split in the number of institutions supported prior to 1979 and after permits the direct comparison of percentages displayed.

TABLE 3

Comparison of Postsecondary Education Institutions Supported by AoA for Long Term Training as Impacted by the 1979 New Grant Competition

			SUPPORT IN 1979	
			YES	NO
All Institutions, 1976-78		(n=102)	(50%)	(50%)
Public Support	YES	(n=71)	52%	48%
Undergraduate Highest	YES	(n=14)	36%	64%
Low Student Enrollment	YES	(n=29)	38%	62%
Historically Black	YES	(n=15)	47%	53%
AoA Support in 1978	YES	(n=71)	55%	45%
AoA Support, $50 K +	YES	(n=65)	60%	40%
AoA Support, 2 years +	YES	(n=54)	62%	38%
Current AGHE Member	YES	(n=75)	63%	37%

Source: See Appendix for explanation of characteristics and source of data

Table 3 indicates that there is little difference between funded and unfunded institutions as a result of the 1979 program competition relative to their auspices (public or private) or Black heritage. Institutions supported in 1978 appear to have had only a slight advantage over institutions last supported in 1976 or 1977. This finding may be due to the fact that some of the institutions not supported by IV-A in 1978 were funded in 1978 under the old IV-C program, concealing the advantage ordinarly held by institutions with prior funding experience.

Some of the same differences indicated between consortia participants and individual awardees in Table 2, appear in Table 3. Institutions having larger student enrollments and offering graduate degrees were more successful in continuing AoA support. The figures also indicate that institutions receiving larger or multi-year awards were more likely to win a new award in 1979 than those who received small and single year awards.

A more detailed analysis this funding reveals that much of the difference shown in Table 3 could be explained by institutions receiving one year, $ 25,000, planning grants in 1976 or 1977. Only two of a dozen institutions receiving planning grants in 1977 were successful in 1979. Very little difference was found for institutions with funding between $25 and $125 thousand. Institutions receiving over $125,000 prior to 1979 were as successful as those below $25,000 were unsuccessful. The duration of an award beyond two years does not appear to be as significant as size of award or highest level of degree awarded.

Institutional Membership in AGHE

The last association displayed in Table 3 is current (1981) membership in the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education. The indication given is that there is a significant difference between institutions funded and not funded by AoA in maintaining membership in AGHE.

Table 4 takes a closer look at the characteristics of institutions that currently hold membership in AGHE and have been funded by AoA at some

time in their history.

TABLE 4

Characteristics of Postsecondary Education Institutions Supported by AoA by Status of Membership in AGHE in 1981

		ALL INSTIT. (n=130)	AGHE MEMBERSHIP (1981) YES (n=87)	NO (n=43)
Public Support	YES	56%	61%	44%
Undergraduate Highest	YES	22%	11%	42%
Low Student Enrollment	YES	32%	28%	42%
Historically Black	YES	15%	7%	30%
AoA Support in 1979	YES	55%	61%	44%

Source: See Appendix for explanation of characteristics and source of data

As indicated in Table 4, membership in AGHE has an impact on all of the characteristics measured. The indication of a difference for historically Black institutions is misleading, however. Since 1976, AoA has supported the National Center on the Black Aged to provide technical assistance to Black institutions. Although excluded from this analysis, AoA currently supports NCBA with a Title IV-A Gerontology Career Preparation Grant to continue its assistance to these institutions. A number of historically Black colleges who might ordinarily join AGHE look to NCBA for guidance. Since NCBA is a non-educational institutional member of AGHE, these institutions do receive, indirectly, the benefits of AGHE membership.

Currently 13 of the 72 individual grantees in the Gerontology Career Preparation Program do not belong to AGHE.* A somewhat lower proportion of the 38 institutions currently funded through a consortia are institutional members. However as in the case of NCBA, at least one member of every consortia is currently a member of AGHE.

---

* 2 current grantees have become AGHE members since this analysis.

Institutional resources, as measured by student enrollment and level of degree awarded, do appear to influence the a decision to become or maintain membership in AGHE. About half of the less than dozen organizations that have dropped membership in AGHE since 1978 have indicated to AGHE that discontinuation of Federal support as the major reason for dropping membership. In nearly all instances the institutions have relatively low student enrollment and do not offer a graduate degree.

Geographic Distribution

The recent KETRON study of AoA long term funding of training programs has found that most students enroll in instructional programs within a fifty mile radius of their residence before enrollment, and seek employment after graduation within that same vicinity. The implication of this finding is that it is important to encourage educational institutions to develop programs in areas where manpower shortages exist. To have some assurance that every urban and rural area populated with large numbers of elderly citizens will be able to tap trained personnel it has been suggested that AoA be more concerned about the geographic distribution of its awards. (KETRON, 1981)

Appendix A includes a complete listing of the 208 institutions who have received AoA support for long term training planning and implementation since 1966 organized by state. Analysis of this list suggests that AoA's record for geographic dispersement of awards has been fairly equitable. Currently, 42 states and the District of Columbia are represented by the 80 individual and consortia awards. All but one of the 8 unrepresented states ranks very low in population and proportion of population age 60 and over.

The geographic dispersement of AoA long term training grantees is similar to that found in the AGHE current membership list, although nearly half of AGHE members have never received a direct AoA grant for long term training. Although it is currently not possible with existing data to determine the major sources of support for non-AoA supported AGHE members, it is believed that a significant number of these institutions

receive some support through Title IV-A funds distributed to state agencies on aging.

Some institutions are known to have received at least one training grant from other Federal agencies . Bolton et. al (1978) report that approximately one-third of operational budgets for gerontology programs are derived from outside sources. The dependence of institutions on outside funding is a major focus of current research being conducted by AGHE.

Implications of Findings on AoA Funding Withdrawal

The original intent for performing an analysis of project data at the institutional performer level was to project the impact of future AoA funding cutbacks or terminations on long term gerontology training program activity in post-secondary education institutions. The findings of this analysis offer some clues for developing guidelines for future programs and for implementing proposal competitions that will sustain as many gains in the field of gerontological career training as possible.

Program competitions which exclude from application a high proportion of previously funded institutions, or inversely, fund a high proportion of new institutional programs, can now be analyzed with respect to the probable endurance of of previous investments. It is also now possible to predict the probable impact of funding new institutions given certain options for funding and resource characteristics of recipients. For example, funding an institution without previous AoA support or perceptable experience for a short duration with an award under $25 to 50,000 is probably a high risk even if it is a graduate institution with high enrollment.

On the other hand, the data indicate that it is possible to protect funding for specific institutional categories, as occurred in the 1979 Gerontology Career Preparation program. If the choice is made to protect programs in vulnerable resource institutions, the impact on

displacement of previously supported, but more advantaged, institutions may not immediately result in calamady for on-going programs. The recent dialog that occured between AoA and its grantees (Craig and Greenberg, 1981a and 1981b) suggest, however, that very few institutions may be immune from feeling some loss in the integrity of their program when Federal funding is lost.

The data call into question the desirability of providing "seed" money to programs without adequate institutional resources to underwrite much of their own development. The recent evaluation of the Career Training in Aging Program indicates that Federal financial support can be effective as a catalyst for attracting other outside support and increasing the commitment of existing institutional resources. (KETRON, 1981).

The data describing AoA support for planning grants and short-term support to consortia, community colleges, and small private baccalaureate institutions, indicate that awards made to these institutions categories may not be effective without continued Federal support.

If Federal financial assistance to postsecondary education institutions is reduced, as proposed by the current Administration, in such areas as student financial assistance and aid to developing institutions and Land Grant colleges and universities, then the impact of AoA funding withdrawal for support of long term gerontological training would be far greater than the potential effects indicated.

If future funding reductions could be avoided by presentation of persuasive evidence of national impact on the current and future capacity for trained personnel in aging, the evidence now missing to support the link between education, training, and good practice in planning, administration, and provision of services to the elderly should have the highest priority.

The AoA and AGHE on-going investigation of impact of funding reductions on former AGHE members should provide more incisive answers to the

question of what happens after Federal support ends. The data analyzed in this paper indicate that institutional attributes contribute to the chances of a program securing additional funding when funding is available. It stands to reason that in the absence of outside support, those with the greatest resources also have the better chance of continuation.

On the other hand, great variances are found within classifications of institutions. The Ketron study (1981) indicates that good programs are often the result of the dedication of a few well placed individuals within an academic establishment. Bolton et. al (1978) and Peterson and Bolton (1980) have shown that survivial may mean where a program is placed in an administrative structure or whether it is authorized by a governing body to ofter degrees and credentials, hire faculty, and counsel students.

The Congress and Executive Branch have been generous in their support of gerontological instructional programs for the past 15 years. They can claim that more than a hundred programs at all levels of instruction, based in almost every field or discipline, have been initiated or altered with this assistance. The knowledge that no promises were made to continue this support without end, did not deter institutions from continuing to seek funds beyound the initiation of programs. Contributing to their optimism of continuation funding were goals established by AoA for support of long term training which only remotely suggested a point of attainment.

The terms of a future partnership between academia and government in aging are not likely to be as generous as before. Fewer institutions will be successful in competition for a reduced allocation of support. The terminal date for projects will be more absolute and the expectations of accomplishment by the grantee more definite. As a result, grantees will have less expectation that their grant award represents only a beginning of external financial assistance, and more expectation that it represents a temporary means for achievement of a self-supported program.

SOURCES USED

Administration on Aging. AoA Education and Training Program PLans and Guidelines, FY1979. U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____ A Preliminary Report On the Development and Implementation of a Federal Manpoer Policy for the Field of Aging. DHHS Publication (OHHS) 81-20048.

Association of Gerontology in Higher Education. National Directory of Educational Programs in Gerontology, 3rd. Edition. (in press)

Christopher R. Bolton, et. al. Gerontology Education in the United States. University of Nebraska at Omaha. February, 1979.

Bruce M. Craig and Saadia R. Greenberg. Issue Paper: Gerontology Career Preapration Program. Administration on Aging. May 1, 1981

Bruce M. Craig and Saadia R. Greenberg. Synthesis of Comments on the Gerontology Career Preparation Program Issue Paper. Administration on Aging. September 15, 1981.

Ketron, Inc. An Evaluation of the Older Americans Act Title V Traineeship Grant Program. September 10, 1973. Administration on Aging. SCAN No. CP 000 018.

_____ Evaluation of the Older Americans Act Title IV-A Career Training Program in Aging. January 31, 1981. Administration on Aging. (SCAN acquisition in process).

Robert R. Moton Memorial Institute. The Moton Guide to American Colleges With a Black Heritage, 1974-75. Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 73-85994.

National Center for Education Statistics. Education Directory, Colleges and Universities, 1979-80. U.S. Department of Education. U.S. Government Printing Office: 1980 625-848 1-3.

David A. Peterson and Christopher R. Bolton. Gerontology Instruction in Higher Education. 1980. Springer Publishing Co.

Clark Tibbetts. National Pattern for Training in Social Gerontology. Paper prepared for presentation at the IVth International Council of Social Gerontolgy. Oslo, Norway. May 21-25, 1972.

APPENDIX A
TITLE IV-A CAREER TRAINING
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS, 1970-80

ALABAMA (10)

University of Alabama
* Alabama A&M University
* University of Alabama-Birmingham
* Alabama State University
* Jacksonville State University
* Miles College
* Oakwood College
* Stillman College
* Talladega College
* Tuskegee Institute

ARIZONA (1)

University of Arizona

ARKANSAS (2)

University of Arkansas-Little Rock
University of Arkansas-Pine Bluff

CALIFORNIA (16)

* Butte College
University of California-Berkeley
University of California-San Francisco
* California State University, Chico
California State University, Sonoma
Charles D. Drew Post Grad. Med. Sch.
* Feather River College
Holy Names College
* Lassen College
Los Angeles Harbor Community College
Los Angeles Valley Community College
San Diego State University
* Shasta College
* College of the Siskiyous
University of Southern California
* Yuba College

COLORADO (3)

Adams State College
Colorado State University
University of Denver

CONNECTICUT (2)

University of Bridgeport
University of Connecticut

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (3)

University of the District of Columbia
George Washington University
Howard University

FLORIDA (4)

University of Florida
Florida State University
University of Miami
University of South Florida

GEORGIA (4)

Albany State College
Clark College
Georgia State College
North Georgia College

HAWAII (1)

University of Hawaii-Manoa

ILLINOIS (7)

* University of Chicago
* University of Illinois-Chicago Circle
* University of Illinois-Medical School
* University of Illinois-Urbana
Northwestern University
University of Southern Illinois-Carbondale
University of Southern Illinois-Edwardsville

INDIANA (1)

Ball State University

* Most recently supported through a consortium award

IOWA (1)

University of Iowa

KANSAS (5)

* Benedictine College
* Donnelly College
* Kansas University
* Kansas State University
Witchita State University

KENTUCKY (3)

University of Kentucky
University of Louisville
Murray State University

LOUISIANA (5)

* Loyola University
Northeast Louisiana State University
* St. Mary's Dominican College
Southern University
* Xavier University

MAINE (1)

University of Maine-Portland/Gorham

MARYLAND (3)

Antioch College
University of Maryland-College Park
University of Maryland-Baltimore

MASSACHUSETTS (16)

* Anna Maria College
* Assumption College
* Becker Junior College
* Boston University
Brandeis University
* Central New England College Of Technology
* Clark University
* College of the Holy Cross
* Quinsigamond Community College

MASSACHUSETTS (CONT)

* University of Massachusetts-Amhurst
* University of Massachusetts-Boston
* University of Massachusetts-Worchester
Springfield Technical Community College
* Worchester Junior College
* Worchester Polytechnical Institute
* Worchester State College

MICHIGAN (5)

Eastern Michigan University
Madonna College
University of Michigan
Wayne State University
Western Michigan University

MINNESOTA (9)

* Augsberg College
* Hamline University
Metropolitan Community College
* Macalester College
University of Minnesota
Minnesota Technical College.
* College of St. Catherine
College of St. Scholastica
* College of St. Thomas

MISSISSIPPI (3)

Mississippi Valley State University
University of Southern Mississippi
Tougaloo College

MISSOURI (9)

* Lincoln University
* University of Missouri-Columbia
* University of Missouri-Kansas City

* Most recently supported through a consortium award

MISSOURI (CONT)

* University of Missouri-Rolla
* University of Missouri-St. Louis
* Missouri Valley College
* Tarkio College
* Rockhurst College
St. Louis University

NEBRASKA (2)

University of Nebraska-Lincoln
University of Nebraska-Omaha

NEVADA (1)

University of Las Vegas

NEW JERSEY (5)

Fairleigh Dickinson University
Rutgers University
College of St. Elizabeth
Seton Hall University
Union College

NEW MEXICO (1)

University of New Mexico

NEW YORK (14)

City University of New York-Graduate Center
City University of New York-Hunter College
City University of New York-Megar Evers College
Columbia University
Fordham University
Mariat College
New York University
North Country Community College
Rockland Community College
St. Thomas Aquinas College
State University of New York-Albany
State University of New York-Buffalo
Syracuse University
Yeshiva University

NORTH CAROLINA (4)

Duke University
Livingstone College
University of North Carolina
Wayne Community College

NORTH DAKOTA (8)

* Dickinson State College
* Mary College
* Mayville State College
* Minot State College
* University of North Dakota-Grand Fork
* North Dakota State School of Science
* North Dakota State University
* Valley City State College

OHIO (9)

University of Akron
Bowling Green University
Capital University
Case Western University
Kent State University
Miami University
Ohio University
Wright State University
* Youngstown State University

OREGON (3)

Oregon University
Oregon State University
Portland State University

PENNSYLVANIA (4)

Kings College
University of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania State University
Temple University

RHODE ISLAND (1)

University of Rhode Island

* Most recently supported through a consortium award

SOUTH CAROLINA (1)

University of South Carolina

SOUTH DAKOTA (1)

Huron College

TENNESSEE (6)

Fisk University
LeMoyne-Owen College
Memphis State University
Middle Tennessee State University
Tennessee State University
Tusculum College

TEXAS (10)

Bishop College
Houston-Tillotson College
North Texas State University
Our Lady of the Lake University
Paul Quinn College
Prarie View A&M University
St. Edwards College
University of Texas-Arlington
University of Texas-Austin
University of Texas-Dallas

UTAH (5)

* Brigham Young University
* Southern Utah State University
University of Utah
* Utah State University
Weber State University

VIRGINIA (6)

Hampton Institute
* Norfolk State University
Southside Community College
* Tidewater Community College
Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia Union University

WASHINGTON (11)

* Bellevue Community College
* Centralia College
* Clark College
* Edmonds Community College
* Highline Community College
* North Seattle Community
* Olympic Technological Community College
* Penninsula Community College
* Skagit Valley College
* Spokane Community College
University of Washington

WEST VIRGINIA (2)

Parkersburg Community College
West Virginia University

WISCONSIN (1)

University of Wisconsin-Madison

WYOMING (1)

University of Wyoming

TOTAL: 208 Institutions

43 States and the District of Columbia

States not represented: Alaska, Vermont, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Idaho, Montana, and Delaware

APPENDIX B
GLOSSORY OF INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND SOURCE DATA USED IN TABLES

Table 1

Long Term Training Grants	Restricted in this analysis to awards made under Title V and Title IV-A career training traineeship programs. Does not include Title IV-C and E Multidisciplinary Centers of Gerontology.
Individual Awards	Awards made to a single institution or campus.
Consortia Participants	Awards made for the express purpose of sharing financial assistance with one or more institutions in addition to the designated principal grantee.
Title V	Title V is used to designate awards made under the Traineeships in Aging Program and subsequent refunding of these programs under other authorities.
Title IV-A	Title IV-A replaced Title V of the Older Americans Act in 1973. Unlike Title V, Title IV-A permits a variety of in-service training and other activities in addtion to support of formal academic programs. For this analysis, Title IV-A is used to designate academic programs only.

Table 2

Public Support and Control	Designation as state or locally supported in the 1979-80 Directory of Higher Education (NCES,1979).
Undergraduate Degree Highest	Listed as an institution that offers degrees or certificates below the masters or advance professional degree level. Directory (Op. Cit.)
Student Enrollment Under 5,000	Total student enrollment for the institution was under 5,000 students. Directory (Op. Cit.)
Historically Black Institution	Identified in the Moton Guide to American Colleges With A Black Heritage (Moton,1974).

Current AGHE Member	Listed as an institutional member by the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education, January, 1981.
AoA Support in 1978	Title IV-A Career Training in Aging project funded in 1978
AoA Support in 1979	Title IV-A Gerontology Career Preparation Project funded in 1979.

Table 3

AoA Support, $ 50 K +	Projects with an average budget in excess of $ 50,000.
AoA Support, 2 years +	Projects receiving support in excess of 2 years. All but 2 Title IV A Gerontology Career Preparation projects were awarded 3 years support.

Table 4

All categories are identical to those used in previous tables.